



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by **M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th April 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal A Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3367431

Green Royd, Studley Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 2QJ

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr Caygill for a full or partial award of costs against North Yorkshire Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to grant planning permission for partial demolition of existing extensions, erection of single storey extension to house, internal alterations to house, installation of new roof to house, installation of new windows to house, extension and alterations to detached garage, installation of gates, with associated external works.
-

Costs application in relation to Appeal B Ref: APP/U2750/Y/25/3367456

Green Royd, Studley Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 2QJ

- The application is made under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) sections 20, 89 and Schedule 3, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr Caygill for a full or partial award of costs against North Yorkshire Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to grant listed building consent for partial demolition of existing extensions, erection of single storey extension to house, internal alterations to house, installation of new roof to house, installation of new windows to house, extension and alterations to detached garage, installation of gates, with associated external works.
-

Decision

1. The application for a full, or partial, award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. Unreasonable behaviour in the context of an application for an award of costs may either be procedural, relating to the process, or substantive, relating to the issues arising from the merits of the appeal.
3. The applicant considers that the refusal of planning permission is unreasonable, and not substantiated by any sound planning reasons, and is contrary to the advice of their heritage consultant. In addition, they refer to the Council not providing adequate evidence to support its reasons for refusal, relying on vague or generalised assertions, and that there was no meaningful attempt to resolve the issues prior to the decision or appeal. This, they consider has resulted in unnecessary expense on professional fees and time preparing and undertaking the appeal.

4. I see from the evidence, that the Council's Conservation Officer twice visited the site, both with the applicant's agent. The Council clearly set out the significance of the listed building and how this would be harmed by the proposals, giving unambiguous reasons for refusal. Whilst the applicant's heritage consultant stated that there is an opportunity to reinstate the proportions of the rear kitchen area and allow new extensions to occur, the proposals go well beyond this. Moreover, I have found that the proposals would cause harm to the listed building and have dismissed the appeal.
5. The applicant refers to there being no meaningful attempt to resolve the issues prior to the decision. However, there are significant areas of the proposed works where there is only limited substantive evidence, and so the necessary justification has not been provided. Therefore, it is unlikely that these issues would have been resolved during the timescale of the applications. In any case, an award of costs relates to the appeal process, not for the determination of the applications.
6. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour, resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. Consequently, the application for an award of costs is refused.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR